

100



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,977	01/06/2000	PETER C. BROOKS	13761-727	2450
26021	7590	07/19/2004	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 500 S. GRAND AVENUE SUITE 1900 LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611			HARRIS, ALANA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/478,977	01/06/2000	Brooks et al.	1361-927

EXAMINER	
Am Harris, Ph.D.	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1642	07/16/2004

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Alana M. Harris (3) Dr. Peter C. Brooks  
(2) Olga Berson, Esq. Ph.D. (4) Dr. Jeffrey W. Quise  
Date of Interview 07/16/2004 (5) Mary Ann Stretch, Esq

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☒ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: Dr. Brooks presented a power point presentation distinctly addressing the peptides, as well as the monoclonal abs embodied by the claims.  
Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached. NA

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4, 6, 10-13, 16-18, 20-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36-38 & 40-69

Identification of prior art discussed: Brooks et al. (J. Clin. Invest. 96:1815-1822, October 1995) & Petitclerc et al. (Cancer Research 59:2724-2730, June 1, 1999)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Dr. Brooks & all participants discussed the pending 102 art rejections, as well as the breadth of the claims in regard to 112 1st issues of enablement & written description. Case law, namely, the Noelle decision was discussed & its relevance to the instant application. The examiner noted to participants that the art rejections would be dropped & the 112 1st issues would be fully reviewed & given consideration. The Exr also noted that she would address these issues with a tech specialist on Monday to insure expedite continued prosecution of the case.  
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has are ready been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Am Harris  
ALANA M. HARRIS, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/16/2004